

Appln No. 10/760,268
Amdt. Dated June 19, 2006
Response to Office Action of April 27, 2006

4

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

We refer to the Final Office Action dated April 27, 2006. In response, we submit that the Office Action has been made final in error for the reasons set out in the following submissions. We believe that the Examiner has misconstrued the claims and therefore newly presented claim 15 highlights the features that distinguish the invention from the cited references.

Amendments

The claims have been amended to cancel claim 1 and redefine the invention in newly presented claim 15. The dependent claims have been amended or cancelled as appropriate.

Independent claim 11 has also been cancelled.

Accordingly, the amendments do not add any new matter.

35 USC §112 - Enablement

Claim 1 stands rejected as indefinite for lack of supporting description for the term "rupture pressure". While the Applicant contests this assertion, claim 1 has been cancelled and this rejection is now moot.

35 USC §102 - Novelty

Each of the claims stand rejected for lack of novelty in light of US 6,067,906 to Ryan et al and/or US 6,799,610 to Yuen.

Neither of the cited references discloses a means to limit the pressure applied to the ink reservoir. In Ryan, the Examiner has equated the spring return in the bellows 16 to be a means for limiting the pressure applied to the ink bag 15. With respect, this is clearly not the case. The return spring in the bellows would reduce the pressure applied by the compressed air, but not limit the pressure. Increasing the air pressure will correspondingly increase the pressure on the bag 15 until the bag 15 (or possibly the bellows 16) ruptures – as all containers inherently do at sufficiently high pressures.

Appln No. 10/760,268
Amdt. Dated June 19, 2006
Response to Office Action of April 27, 2006

5

Likewise in Yuen, the Examiner has equated the concertinas folds in the side walls of the ink pouch 16 to be a means for limiting the pressure applied by the first housing member 12. Again the folded side wall 84 may have a restorative force but this only reduces the pressure applied by the housing member 12. It does not limit the applied pressure to a predetermined maximum value.

To clarify this distinction, the invention has been recast in new claim 15. The pressure applicator applies pressure to the deformable ink reservoir via the resilient member. As the relative movement between the pressure applicator and the ink reservoir deforms the resilient member, the restorative force in the resilient member acts to pressuring the printing fluid in the reservoir. The amount of relative movement between the ink reservoir and the pressure applicator is limited, and therefore, so to is the deformation of the resilient member and the associated restorative force. Regardless of how much manual force is applied to the pressure applicator, the pressure on the reservoir is limited to a predetermined maximum. This prevents the user from overloading the reservoir and causing it to rupture.

Ryan and Yuen do not recognize these issues or teach a means to limit the pressure applied to the ink bags. Accordingly, they fail to anticipate the present invention.

Appln No. 10/760,268
Amdt. Dated June 19, 2006
Response to Office Action of April 27, 2006

6

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the citation do not disclose essential elements of the present invention. Therefore the Applicant believes that the final rejection was raised in error and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, withdrawal of the finality of the previous report and favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762